REMARKS

Claims 1, 2 and 6-12 are pending in this application. By this Amendment, claim 1 is amended for clarity. No new matter is added. Reconsideration of the application in view of the above amendment and the following remarks is respectfully requested.

Applicant appreciates the courtesies shown to Applicant's representatives by Examiner Musser during the November 10 personal interview. Applicant's separate record of the substance of the personal interview is incorporated into the following remarks.

The Office Action, on page 2, rejects claims 1, 2 and 6-12 under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

The Office Action asserts that because the flat pieces of a septum should be able to contact the developable surface everywhere, this would result in an error of zero and the maximum error E being designated between 2 and 2.5 mm contradicts the possibility of an error being zero. Without conceding the appropriateness of this rejection, claim 1 is amended to recite, among other features, a measurement of a maximum deviation E between a point on a developable surface of any of the plurality of component parts and the point on the developable surface when the third layer is in its final shape is less than or equal to 2.5 mm.

The amendment to claim 1 clarifies that it is not a matter of the flat pieces of the septum being able to contact the developable surface, as the Office Action indicates, but rather that a developable surface when assembled has a shape within the error E such that the developable surface may obtain the desired final shape of the septum. As explained during the personal interview, an error is a plus or minus tolerance that may fall above or below the desired shape, as illustrated in Fig. 4.

Further, the Office Action asserts that because an error E may be as much as 2.5 mm, the error of the developable surface could not be zero. However, as explained during the personal interview, the maximum deviation E is a distance between a point on the

developable surface of any of the plurality of component parts and the point of the developable surface when the third layer is in its final shape. In other words, the maximum deviation E is a measurement taken before the applied force deforms the component parts forcing the component parts of the third layer into the final shape.

For at least the foregoing reasons, the rejection of claims 1, 2 and 6-12 under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph, are unreasonable. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claims 1, 2 and 6-12 under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph are respectfully requested.

The Office Action, on page 3, rejects claims 1, 2 and 6-12 under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claim 1 is also amended to obviate this rejection. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claims 1, 2 and 6-12 under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph are respectfully requested.

The Office Action, on page 3, rejects claims 1, 2 and 7-12 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,203,656 to Syed in view of U.S. Patent No. 4,534,813 to Williamson et al. (hereinafter "Williamson") and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,073,457 to Blackwell. The Office Action, on page 6, rejects claims 1, 6, 11 and 12 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Applicant's allegedly admitted prior art in view of Syed, Williamson and Blackwell. These rejections are respectfully traversed.

Syed is directed to an acoustic liner that is made by placing a raw adhesive septum between a pair of opposite honeycomb cores, and curing the septum to integrally bond the cores to it (Abstract). The Office Action asserts that Syed teaches many of the features recited in at least independent claim 1. The Office Action concedes that Syed fails to teach forming the septum by applying separate parts to the honeycomb on the mold such that they

abut each other so as to approximate the final shape. The Office Action relies on Williamson, and its disclosure of a compound curve-flat pattern process, to make up for this shortfall.

Williamson is directed to a process that forms flat pattern equivalents for curved surfaces (Abstract). The Office Action further concedes that the combination of Syed and Williamson fails to teach an adhesive being present on the septum which allows the components to be placed on it before bonding. The Office Action relies on Blackwell, and its disclosure of a repositionable adhesive to make up for this shortfall.

Blackwell is directed to a repositionable adhesive that is comprised of acrylic pressure sensitive resins (Abstract). The Office Action asserts that it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill to have used a repositionable adhesive such as that taught in Blackwell on the septum components because this would allow placement of the components and their adjustment until the optimal placement is determined.

The Office Action asserts that one of ordinary skill would appreciate that a maximum error being between 2 and 2.5 mm would have been obvious because the final shape is made of developable shapes and pieces of the septum would be in close contact with the developable surface and therefore the error would be less than 2.5 mm. The Office Action further asserts that one of ordinary skill would appreciate that the layers are not very elastic and would minimize the distance between the first and final locations as much as possible to prevent tearing, leading to an error of less 2.5 mm. This analysis of the Office Action fails for at least the following reason.

It is unreasonable for the Office Action to assert that one of ordinary skill would have recognized that a maximum error for the developable surface is less than 2.5 mm would have been obvious in view of the currently-applied references and what the Office Action considers appreciative. Williamson, at col. 3, lines 45-55, teaches that the maximum error or the total error using the mathematical models taught in Williamson would be equal to $R\theta - 2R \sin \theta/2$,

or in the instance where a total arc length in Williamson is 49.97 ... inches, the total error would be only 0.0007689. Therefore, considering the preciseness of the process taught by Williamson, one of ordinary skill would not have considered an allowable maximum error in the shape of the developable surface from the final shape of the septum to be less than or equal to 2.5 mm, as recited in independent claim 1.

As discussed during the personal interview, while Williamson may teach an error that is less than 2.5 mm, the error is so small that one of ordinary skill would not have even considered an error as large as 2.5 mm. Having an error that is as large as the claimed maximum error may result in defects in Williamson when the final shape is achieved.

For at least the foregoing reasons, no combination of Syed, Williamson, Blackwell and Applicant's allegedly admitted prior art, would have suggested the combination of all of the features recited in independent claim 1. Further, dependent claims 2 and 6-12 would also not have been suggested by any combination of the currently-applied references for at least the dependence of these claims on independent claim 1, as well as for the separately patentable subject matter that each of these claims recites.

Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections of claims 1, 2 and 6-12 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over the various combinations of currently-applied references are respectfully requested.

Applicant's representatives presented the above arguments to Examiner Musser during the November 10 personal interview. Examiner Musser indicated that she understood Applicant's position and would further consider Applicant's position upon submission of a formal response.

In view of the foregoing, Applicant respectfully submits that this application is in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and prompt allowance of claims 1, 2 and 6-12 are earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner believe that anything further would be desirable in order to place this application in even better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact Applicant's undersigned representative at the telephone number set forth below.

Respectfully submitted,

William P. Berridge
Registration No. 30,024

Moshe K. Wilensky
Registration No. 56,263

WPB:MJS/acd

Date: November 20, 2009

OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC
P.O. Box 320850
Alexandria, Virginia 22320-4850
Telephone: (703) 836-6400

DEPOSIT ACCOUNT USE
AUTHORIZATION
Please grant any extension
necessary for entry;
Charge any fee due to our
Deposit Account No. 15-0461